Sabbato-Dominica.

OR, A FEW PROPOSITIONS

tending to reconcile the seeming Difference, between the lettter of the Law and Christian Libertie, in the Doctrine of the *Sabbath* and *Lords day*, briefly propounded, explained, and confirmed.

Together with an *Appendix*, unto the same *Propositions*, tending to satisfie some exceptions likely to be taken to them.

By *Irenæus Philalethes.*

OR,

One, that unfainedly desires to keep the unitie of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and speaking the truth in love, to grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ.

Many shal run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Dan. 12. 4.

LONDON:
Printed by *T.P.* and *M.S.* for *Phil. Stephens*, at the golden Lyon in Pauls Church yard. 1643.

COMMITTEE

TO THE HONOVRABLE HOVSE OF *COMMONS* now assembled in PARLIAMENT.

WHen publick report, the great Intelligencer of the world, had filled almost all mens minds with an earnest expectation, that by the advise and order of this Honourable House a Nationall Synod would be shortly assembled, or at least a choise

number of the best Divines selected to assist the high Court of Parliament, in ordering the affairs of Religion in this Land; some (who had seen these little Treatises, and thought there might some good use be made of them; as aiming, in a moderate way, at the discovery of that common Truth, which all men ought to seek, and that in some particulars of importance, which have of late been much disputed) did not onely, as formerly they had done, move me to permit the publication of them, but likewise to premise, by way of Preface, something with relation to the expected Synod or Assembly. Which, unlesse that course were setled already,

ready, I know not how to do better, then by craving leave of this Honourable House (as the great hinge upon which that heavenly motion hangs) to cast these little Treatises, as the poore widow did her two mites, into the treasurie of the Temple: and humbly to professe, that my intent is not, in any thing wherein I vary from others, to engage either them or my self in the maintenance of our own opinions, but with willing submission unto better judgements, onely to offer occaſion of consideration unto all, in some particulars, which otherwise perhaps might lye below their thoughts. Truth drops not alwaies from the clouds, but sometimes

springs out of the earth, and at a little spark of fire on the hearth (if it be not with too strong a breath blown out at the first) a candle may be lighted for the use and benefit of all that are in the house. That I conceal my name is rather out of conscience of mine own unworthinesse, and a desire I have to avoid the very shew of affectation, then fear to fall under the censures of any. For private imputations, I shall let them passe, as going but on equall ground: but if publick Authoritie, either in the voice of this Honorable House, or otherwise, shal stoop so lowe, as to interpret it a fault, I shall willingly submit my self to censure, thankfully receive,

and

and patiently undergo deſerved puniſhment, and ſtill continue to pray, as I do, that the Spirit of Wiſedome and underſtanding, the Spirit of counſell and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord may reſt, and be ſo multiplied upon you all, that the iſſue of all your conſultations may be ſuch, as may give all men iuſt occaſion to ioyn in conſort with the Angel and the heavenly hoſt in praiſing God, and ſaying, Glory unto God in the higheſt, and on earth peace, good will towards men: that our eyes may ſee the King in his beauty, and Ieruſalem a quiet habitation, a Tabernacle that ſhall not be taken down, nor

any of the ſtakes thereof removed, neither any of the cords thereof broken. *Which he that hath ſo long ago promiſed wil certainly at length in his good time perform, if men have but faith enough to wait with patience, that after they have done the will of God, they may receive the promiſes, which in Jeſus Chriſt are, yea, and Amen, unto the glory of God, who is the bleſſed, and onely Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, to whom be honour and power everlaſting.* Amen.

TO

TO ALL THAT SEEK THE TRVTH so, as becomes the Friends of Peace and Holineſſe.

ALthough the Sabbath *be a day of reſt, yet the queſtions, that have been moved about it, I doubt not, will be reſtleſſe, untill that truth be brought to light, wherewith, if not all, yet moderate minded men at leaſt, may reſt themſelves ſatisfied. Some of that truth I think I have found, and that appertaining to the very foundation, upon which the re-*

ligious obſervation of the Chriſtian Sabbath *or* Lords day *is grounded,* viz. the perpetuall morality of the fourth Commandment. *Which whileſt ſome have openly ſet themſelves of purpoſe, with all their might and maine, not onely to deface, but alſo to demoliſh utterly, crying,* Down with it, down with it, even to the ground: *they have been much encouraged, on the one ſide, by thoſe, who, thinking to ſettle it ſurer, have onely cemented with ſand, or daubed it over with untempered morter; by the weakneſſe of their evidence brought the ſtrength of their cauſe more in queſtion, and made it ſeeme leſſe defenſible to them, that had a mind to bend their force againſt it, when they ſaw the defendants ſo poorely provided, diſdaining them as* Goliah *did* David, *and triumphing before the victory, as if they would have ſaid,* Videas ante delectet contra retiarium ferula: *on the*

the other ſide by thoſe, who preſuming it capable of ſuch ſuperſtructions, have raiſed a vaſt pile of rigorous impoſitions upon it, enough almoſt to cruſh it to pieces. So that the Chriſtian Sabbath *or* Lords day *began to be crucified between Superſtition and Profaneneſſe, as Chriſt himſelf, the Lord of the Sabbath, was between two theeves: and they, that had a mind to try their ſtrength, in reſtoring it unto its ancient right, found their paſſage unto their adverſaries ſuch, as* Jonathan *and his Armourbearer had to the gariſon of the Philiſtines, between* Bozez *and* Zenah, *a ſharp rock on the one ſide, and a ſharp rock on the other ſide, which to climbe up they had need to make uſe both of their hands and feet. This conſideration, together with the ſollicitations of ſome private friends, about five yeers ago, ſet me on work, to ſearch about this foundation, to ſee if I could find upon what ground it*

ſtood;

ſtood, and whether their mouthes, that were diſpoſed to cry down the morality of the fourth Commandment, with ſo much confidence, as if there had been no colour either of Religion or of reaſon for the maintenance thereof, might not be ſtopped, and the edge of thoſe arguments abated, whereby they made account, they ſhould cut aſunder all the ſinews of that opinion for ever: whether the head of that Philiſtine, which defied the armies of the living God, might not be cut off with his own ſword, and the reproach taken away from Iſrael.

That endeavour then brought forth theſe Propoſitions, wherein though the principall thing, that I aymed at, was to enquire, whether the morality of the fourth Commandment *might not be made manifeſt, by ſuch evidence, as nature it ſelf might ſee ſufficient reaſon to ſubſcribe unto, yet I thought by the way I had met with ſuch truths, as might ſerve to*

give ſome grouud of ſatisfaction unto other doubts, both in the doctrinall and practicall part, which I drew into corollaries or concluſions, ſuch as I thought might be naturally deduced, from the ſame Propoſitions. But knowing how apt men are to overween their own works, and reſolving that I might be, though willingly I would not be deceived, I did both often enter into examination of that which I had done my ſelf, and ſometimes, as opportunitie was offered, ſubmit it unto the cenſure of others. Which courſe occaſioned, though no alteration in the maine, yet ſome additions unto that which I had done at firſt, and at laſt brought forth that Appendix, wherein I have endeavoured to remove all the doubts, that probably I could conjecture might be made of any thing therein. And now, for that common intereſt, that all men have in truth, I am content to put this work upon a publick triall,

in

in hope that I ſhall either be better confirmed in mine own opinion, by the approbation of others, whoſe judgemẽts I may better build on then mine own, or meet with ſo much ingenuous charitie in ſome, as meekly to make mee underſtand wherein I have erred, and to direct me better.

The way of truth is that I ſeek, but whether I have found it already my ſelf, or ſhall hereafter be ſhewed it by another is not ſo much materiall. I would not willingly either like error any thing the better, becauſe it is homeborn, nor truth the worſe, becauſe it comes to me as a ſtranger from another place. Which indifferency that I may not be drawn from, but, as far as I can, keep my ſelf free from any perſonall engagement. I am bold to put on the borrowed name of

Irenæus Philalethes.

Sabbato-Dominica:

A FEW PROPOSITIONS

tending to reconcile the seeming Difference between the Letter of the Law and Christian *Libertie, in the Doctrine of the* SABBATH and LORDS-DAY, briefly propounded, explained, and confirmed.

The first Proposition.

THE fourth *Commandment* in the literall sence and meaning of it doth designe a *seventh day* in proportion onely, not the *seventh day* in order, also to be unto the people

ple of God the ordinarie time of holy reſt.

By the literall ſenſe and meaning of the fourth *Commandment*, I underſtand that interpretation of the words which according to the rules of *Grammaticall* inſtruction they may, and in analogie to other places of Scripture, and the common received principles of Religion they muſt bear.

By a *ſeventh day* in proportion onely, not the *ſeventh day* in order; alſo I underſtand one day of *ſeven* indefinitely taken, not ſpecially reſtrained, in reſpect of order unto this or that *ſeventh*: accounting from one onely fixed period, but ſo left at liberty that it may indifferently be underſtood of any of the *ſeven*, firſt or laſt, or ſecond, third, fourth, fifth or ſixth, to be reckoned from that one prefixed period. As in other caſes, *Levit.* 23.13. *Two tenth deals of fine flower,*

and

and the fourth part of an Hin. And *Levit.* 26. 31. the fifth part of the tythes must needs be understood of such a proportion, *viz.* a *tenth*, a *fourth*, a *fifth*, without any respect unto order at all; so as to imply that it must of necessitie be this or that *tenth*, *fourth* or *fifth*: for if it were any part at all of that proportion it was sufficient.

By the people of God I understand all those, and onely those, who by profession of the true Religion take upon them to be in speciall covenant with the true God: for unto all those and onely unto those, I take the Law of the two Tables to be given by God at Mount *Sinai*: not unto the Nation of the *Israelites* alone, nor unto all mankind universally, but indefinitely onely unto all, as all had an unconfined liberty to become *Israelites* by profession before the birth of Christ, and Christians after,

ter, and ſo to enter into ſpeciall covenant with God, as the *Iſraelites* had done before the Law was publiſhed. *Exod.* 19. 5. &c. (See the *Appendix* in the firſt exception and the anſwer to it.)

By the ordinarie time of *holy reſt*, I underſtand that ſufficient and convenient part of time which nature it ſelf, being ruled by right reaſon, will confeſſe, ought uſually to be ſet apart for the ſolemne exercíſe of thoſe actions of religious ſervice, which are to be performed unto the true God by them that would have and ſhew that they have him to be their God in their lives and converſations.

The Propoſition thus explained, I confirm it thus.

The fourth *Commandment* in the litterall ſence and meaning of it, doth deſigne either a *ſeventh day* in proportion onely, and not the *ſeventh day* in order alſo to be unto

to the people of God, the ordinarie time of *holy reſt*, or the *ſeventh day* in order onely, and not a *ſeventh day* in proportion alſo, or both a *ſeventh day* in proportion, and the *ſeventh day* in order alſo. But not the *ſecond* nor the *third*, *ergo* the firſt.

The *major* is evident of it ſelf. For יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי *dies ſeptimus*, *Exod.*20.10. indifferently ſignifies a *ſeventh day*, or the *ſeventh day*, (*a*) and (*the*) whereby the difference is expreſſed being particles proper to our Engliſh tongue, to which there is neither in the Hebrew, nor the Latine, nor peradventure in moſt other languages any thing anſwerable: which defect the Schools ſupply by diſtinguiſhing of *dies ſeptimus formaliter*, and *dies ſeptimus materialiter*. And though we ſhould give an emphaſis unto the Article הַ, and read it *dies ille ſeptimus*, *that ſeventh*

venth day (which no neceſſitie enforceth us to do, unleſſe withall we take our ſelves tyed to tranſlate in the nextverſe הַשָּׁמַיִם *cœlos illos*, and הָאָרֶץ *terram illam*, *thoſe heavens*, and *that earth*, as though there were ſome other heavens and another earth, which were not made in the ſix dayes but in ſome other) yet no ſhift whatever will ſerve us to evade the neceſſity of this truth, that either it muſt be underſtood of a *ſeventh* in proportion onely, or the *ſeventh* in order onely, or both: for *proportion* and *order* muſt needs be either joyned or ſevered in the ſignification of שְׁבִיעִי *ſeptimus*.

The *minor* conſiſteth of two parts: whereof the former that the fourth *Commandment* in the literall ſence and meaning of it doth not deſigne the *ſeventh day* in order onely, and not a *ſeventh day* in proportion alſo, will eaſily, I conceive

ceive, be granted: for otherwiſe that *ſeventh* joyned with the other *ſix* ſhould either exceed or come ſhort of the whole: unleſſe we will ſay that every *ſeventh day* is either longer or ſhorter then ſome of the other ſix: or that the whole revolution of time may not according to the Scripture account be meaſured by weeks, whereof every one hath neither more nor leſſe but ſeven equall dayes apiece; if not in exact Aſtronomicall computation, yet at leaſt in ordinary vulgar account. The B. of *Ely*, *pag.* 177. obſerveth that the fourth *Commandment* made one day of ſeven a weekly Sabbath: and *pag.* 179. he ſaith, the ſubject of that *Commandment* is a naturall day of 24. houres.

The latter part of the *minor* that the fourth *Commandment* in the literall ſence and meaning of it doth not deſigne both a *ſeventh*

day

day in proportion, and the *seventh day* in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of *holy rest*, is that which alone, I suppose, will be denied; and therefore onely needs to be confirmed. And to that pupose I would argue thus.

That interpretation which includeth the common and naturall equitie of the *Commandment*, which obligeth all the people of God to the end of the world, and nothing else is the literall sence and meaning of the *Commandment* if the *Grammaticall* construction of the words will bear it, and enforce no more. But that interpretation wherein the fourth *Commandment* is taken to designe a *seventh day* in proportion onely, and not the *seventh day* in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of *holy rest*, includeth the common and naturall

equitie

equitie of the *Commandment*, which obligeth all Gods people to the end of the world, and nothing elſe: and the *Grammaticall* conſtruction of the words will bear it, and enforce no more. *Ergo*,

The *major* I preſume will not be denied. (See the Appendix in the ſecond exception, and the Anſwer to it.)

The *minor* conſiſteth of two parts. For proofe of the former, *viz.* that that Interpretation whereinthe fourth *Commandment* is taken to deſigne a *ſeventh day* in proportion onely, and not the *ſeventh day* in order alſo, to be unto the people of God the ordinarie time of *holy reſt*, includeth the common and naturall equitie of the *Commandment*, which obligeth all Gods people to the end of the world, and nothing elſe; I referre me to the reverend and very learned L. B. of *Ely*, in his Treatiſe of the

the Sabbath & Lords day, whose words are these, *pag.* 120. *The common and naturall equitie of this Commandment obligeth mankinde to the end of the world.* And *pa* 121. *the equitie of the fourth Commandment is of the law of Nature.* And *pag.* 90. *the common and naturall equitie of that Commandment is morall: viz.* that Gods people are obliged to observe a convenient and sufficient time for publick and solemne divine worsh p, and for religious and Ecclesiasticall duties. And abstinence from secular labour and negotiation, and keeping holy one day of every week for mans temporall and naturall refreshing, and for the spirituall good of his soul is very agreeable both to naturall and religious equitie; and it is grounded upon the ancient custome and practise of Gods people in time of the Law. Where in the Margent he quotes

out

out of *Chrysostome in Genes. Hom.* 10. *Jam hinc ab initio doctrinam hanc insinuat nobis Deus, erudiens in circulo hebdomadæ diem unum integrum,* ἡμέραν ἅπασαν ἀνατιθέναι καὶ ἀφορίζειν τῇ τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐργασίᾳ. *Consecrare & designare operationi spiritualium.*

Which passage of *Chrysostome* appears unto me to intimate more then the Bishop seemeth to take notice of: *viz.* that the ancient custome and practise of Godspeople in keeping holy one day of every week was taught them by God even from the beginning. Which if it be true, and the thing in it self very agreeable both to naturall and religious equitie, as the B. confesseth, I do not see what colour of reason any man can have to pretend it ceremoniall, or peculiarly appropriated in the *Commandment* unto the Israelites alone: unlesse he will say, that what was generally intended unto all

men before, was afterward in the fourth *Commandment* particularly limited, and restrained unto the Israelites alone; which he that will pretend to be true of the fourth *Commandment*, me thinks must be forced to confesse as true of all the other nine.

And whereas he pretendeth that our keeping holy now one day of every week is grounded upon the ancient custome and practise of Gods people in time of the Law, I demand whether that custome and practise it self were not grounded either upon a Law of Nature, or at least upon a positive Law of divine institution: and if so (as I think it cannot be denied) why the keeping holy now of one day in every week should rather be said to be grounded upon that custome and practise, then upon that Law whether naturall or positive on which that custome and practise

ctise it self at first was grounded. Since it is not safe grounding upon any custome or practise how common or ancient soever, unlesse that custome and practise it self be grounded upon such a foundation either in reason or Religion as still stands in force as wel for the latter as the former practise. Otherwise I do not see but that a *Turke* might plead as well for his circumcision, as grounded upon the ancient custome and practise of Gods people in time of the Law, as a Christian for his keeping holy one day of every week, as grounded upon the like custome and practise, unlesse this custome and practise of keeping holy one day in every week were it self grounded on a foundation of another nature then that of circumcision was.

Again, in that passage of the B. I observe that he makes that to be the common and naturall equitie

of the fourth *Commandment*, which I ever conceived to belong unto the first. For the first *Com.* requiring that we should have the true God to be our God, not onely in our minds and in our hearts, but likewise in our lives and conversations (which must be by performing unto him not onely sudden and occasionall, but likewise set and solemne actions of religious service, as I presume will not be denied) requires withall that a sufficient and convenient time should be set apart and employed to that purpose: since mens actions, especially externall, cannot at all be performed but in time and place, nor as they ought to be, unlesse that time and place be both sufficient and convenient. So that if this were all that the fourth *Commandment* required of Gods people in requiring this, it should require no more then in effect the first

first *Commandment* had done already, nor give any further direction concerning the time to be employed in ſolemne worſhip, then might as well be underſtood concerning the place wherein that worſhip ought to be performed, which yet it is evident that it hath done. And I thinke I may adde that it was requiſite it ſhould be ſo: that ſo I may anſwer their demand that aſk a reaſon why God ſhould rather deſigne a proportion of time then of place for his ſolemne ſervice. Although ſuch a queſtion me thinks ſhould need no anſwer, ſince it either is or at leaſt ſhould be enough for us that God hath done ſo: yet this we may conceive to be ſome reaſon of it. Firſt, becauſe time is a more inſeperable circumſtance of any action then place can be. *Moſes* deſcribing the creation, *Gen.* 1. 1. begins with the beginning of

time, and so proceeds accordingly: he saith not where, but when each thing was done: even place it self can have no being but in time. Secondly, because one and the same proportion of time may be observed by Gods people every where in performing the solemne actions of religious service, whether publickly or privately, but one and the same proportion of place cannot. Thirdly, because there are general divisions of time into distinct proportions made by God himself even in the creation, and first constitution of time, the characters whereof stand stamped in the course of nature, by which even naturall reason may be guided in the choice of a sufficient and convenient part to be employed in solemne worship, as we shall have occasion to consider more anon. But there are no such divisions of place which is alwaies

waies proportionable to the thing that is placed, and differs according to the various circumſtances of the ſame.

Beſides, if this, and this onely be the common and naturall equitie of the fourth *Commandment*, that a ſufficient and convenient time ſhould be employed in holy worſhip, as it is pretended; I demand whether purpoſely intended, and expreſſed in the words, or onely preſuppoſed, and taken for granted. If purpoſely intended, and expreſſed; I demand whether in a phraſe of ſpeech that is to be underſtood properly or tropically. If properly, then it doth not onely expreſſe the neceſſity of obſerving a ſufficient and convenient time, but likewiſe ſhew plainly what part of time is ſufficient and convenient, *viz.* a *ſeventh day*, one day in every week. If tropically, I demand what kind of trope it

can be, wherein the generall may ſo be underſtood by the ſpeciall, as that the ſpeciall it ſelf muſt not be neceſſarily included in the generall. For if by the Sabbath day or a *ſeventh day* in the fourth *Commandment* be intended a ſufficient and convenient time, we muſt either deny that a *ſeventh day* is a ſufficient and convenient time, or elſe acknowledge it therein required, as that which is preſuppoſed to be the common and naturall equitie of the *Commandment*: which will appear more plainly to be ſo, if we can prove that there is no other part of time which nature will acknowledge to be ſufficient and convenient, but onely one day in every week, as anon I ſhall aſſay to do. If onely preſuppoſed, and taken for granted, I ſee not why we ſhould eſteeme it more proper to the fourth *Commandment*, then to the *ſecond* or the

third:

third: or why we ſhould not as well eſteeme the other neceſſarie duties of the *firſt*, as that we muſt have a God, and that the true God to be our God, that we muſt know him, love him, fear him, and obey him, and the like, to be the common and naturall equitie of the fourth *Commandment* (for all theſe muſt needs be therein preſuppoſed, and taken for granted) and ſo in the end reduce them all to one, without any diſtinction, except it be in ſuch particulars onely as we reſolve to reject at our pleaſures, as not appertaining unto us but to the *Iſraelites* alone. (See the *Appendix* in the third Exception, and the *Anſwer* to it.)

Again, I obſerve that the B. in that paſſage joynes publick and ſolemne worſhip together, as likewiſe religious and Eccleſiaſticall duties; as though theſe were termes of equall extent, or that

Gods people were equally obliged to them all by one and the same morall Law. Which I take to be a common errour, and the occasion of many mistakes amongst them that have written upon this subject. For all solemne divine worship is not publick, nor are all religious duties Ecclesiasticall. And as it is one thing to be exercised and employed in the solemne actions of religious service simply considered, and another thing to be exercised and employed in the same solemne actions of religious service as they are publick and Ecclesiasticall: so the bond whereby Gods people are obliged to be so exercised and employed, must be referred unto divers *Commandments*. For the solemne actions of religious service simply considered to the first *Com.* as before, for the publick and Ecclesiasticall exercise and performance

mance of them, if directed and required immediately by God himself, as amongst the Israelites in many things it was unto the first *Commandment* likewise, wherein generally all obedience unto God himself is enjoyned: if immediately depending upon the authoritie of Civill and Ecclesiasticall Governors, as now adayes it doth unto the first *Commandment*. As for the fourth *Commandment*, I conceive that the scope thereof is no more, but onely in a speciall manner to designe that proportion of time which is ordinarily to be employed by Gods people in solemne worship; and to give a generall intimation of the use and end unto which that time must be employed.

And in that respect I conceive the B. expression not to be so full as it might have been, when he saith, that the keeping holy one day

day in every week is very agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie: having ſaid before that Gods people are obliged by the common and naturall equitie of the *Commandment* which is morall, to obſerve a ſufficient and convenient time for ſolemne worſhip: for upon that ground I conceive it may be probably at leaſt pretended, that naturall and religious equitie will not onely allow of that practiſe as fitting and convenient, but likewiſe avow it for requiſite and neceſſarie: as if to that purpoſe one ſhould argue thus.

If naturall equitie oblige men of neceſſity to obſerve a ſufficient and convenient time for ſolemne worſhip; then naturall equitie muſt preſuppoſe men able to judge of the time to be ſo obſerved, whether it be ſufficient & convenient or no: otherwiſe naturall equitie

ſhall

ſhall bind men to do that, which whether they have done or no they cannot tell, & ſo they ſhall not be a law unto themſelves, or their cõſcience witnes with them, contrary unto that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. And naturall equitie cannot preſuppoſe men able to judge of the time to be obſerved for ſolemne worſhip, whether it be ſufficient and convenient or no, but upon this ſuppoſition, that either it muſt be all time abſolutely, or a part of time onely. The former I preſume will not be pretended agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, I therefore let it paſſe. If the latter, it muſt be a part of time, either once onely to be choſen and obſerved, or often. The former I likewiſe preſume will not be pretended agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, and therefore I let that alſo paſſe. If the latter, it muſt be either

ther ſuch a part of time as ariſes upon an arbitrary artificiall diviſion of time, which man himſelf at his own pleaſure hath been or may be author of: or elſe ſuch a part of time as ariſes upon a naturall diviſion of time which God himſelf made at the creation; the characters whereof are written in the courſe of nature: out of the parts whereof, if any one be taken and employed for ſolemne worſhip, it will ordinarily be ſufficient and convenient.

Not the former, but the latter. For the generall determination of a common and naturall equitie which obligeth all mankind muſt needs depend upon ſomething in nature, of as early an originall, as large an extent, as unchangeable conſtancie, and long continuance as it ſelf. But no artificiall arbitrary diviſion of time can be coevall unto that common and naturall,

rall equitie, which in this case is to be determined by it, neither so universally known, or perpetually immutable, and consequently certain as that which is naturall. So that either there must be some such certain division of time apparent unto nature, or nature will never be able of it selfe to determine whether such or such a time be sufficient and convenient to be ordinarily employed in the solemne actions of religious service or no.

The maine things then to be enquired in this case are: First, what naturall divisions of time there are, the characters whereof were at the beginning, even in the creation by God himself the Creator, imprinted in the course of nature. Secondly, which of those divisions it is that common and naturall equitie being called unto counsell, must needs acknowledge and confesse,

feſſe, doth afford a ſufficient and convenient time to be employed in ſolemne worſhip.

For the firſt, it is evident both by the hiſtory of the Creation, *Gen.* 1. and 2. and by the obſervations of art and experience, that there are foure main diviſions of time, which God himſelfe hath made, namely, into dayes, into weeks, into moneths, and into yeers: whereof the ſecond and the third ariſe out of the multiplied revolution of the firſt and the laſt of the third.

Here nothing, I ſuppoſe, will be denied or doubted of, at leaſt there is nothing that concerns our preſent purpoſe much, but whether the diviſion of time into weeks, whereof every one conſiſts of ſeven dayes apiece, be a naturall diviſion of Gods own inſtitution in the Creation: the characters whereof may be obſerved in the

the course of nature. For the affirmative whereof, I doubt not but I might produce the unanimous consent both of Fathers, Schoolmen, and Interpreters upon *Genesis* the first and second, as these few particulars which I have had opportunity to take notice of, perswade me to beleeve.

Basil. in Hexam. hom. 2. Deus sane qui temporis naturam creavit, mensuras ipsi ac signa, nimirum spatia dierum adjunxit, septimanaque ipsum metiens, in orbem septimanam in sese semper versari jussit, curricula temporis ac motiones enumerantem: & unum item diem septimanam conficere, ipsum in sese septies redeuntem.

Lactan. de divino premio Lib. 7. cap. 14. Dies septem sunt, quibus per vicem revolutis orbes conficiuntur annorum, &c.

Clem. Alex. lib. 6. Strom. In septenariis totus mundus circumagitur

omnium

omnium quæ & viva gignuntur, & quæ naſcuntur, &c.

Hieron. in Amos, cap. 5. Septenarium numerum eſſe ſanctum etiam Sabbatum probat, in quo requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus ſuis—— Novit & hoc ſecularis philoſophia & medicorum libri—— ita ab initio mundi diebus conditis, ut omnes labores & moleſtiæ ſeptimo numero conquieſcant—— & ſeptem aſtra juxta numerum dierum dicuntur errantia, &c.

Auguſt. ad Caſulan. Epa. 86. Septem dies ſunt, qui volumine temporum per ſua veſtigia revocantur.

Id. de Geneſi ad literam, lib. 4. ca. 18. Dies ſeptimus & ipſe unus eſt dierum, qui omnes ſeptem ſunt, quorum repetitione menſes & anni & ſeculæ peraguntur: ut mane quod poneretur poſt veſperam ſeptimi hoc eſſet initium octavi diei, de quo jam deinceps ſilendum fuit, quia idem primus eſt ad quem reditur, à quo

rurſus

rursus hebdomadis series ordiatur. Vnde probabilius est istos quidem septem dies illorum nominibus & numero alios atque alios sibimet succedentes currendo temporalia peragere spatia.

Lomb. lib. 2. sent. dist. 15. Numerando dies usque ad septimum procedimus, & dicimus septem esse dies, quorum repetitione omne tempus agitatur.

And peradventure much more might be added to this purpose out of their observations, that are expert in Astronomie, Astrologie, and Chronologie, as I am induced to conceive by that of *Jos. Scalig. Can. Isagog. lib. 3. cap. 4.* whose words are these. *Vtimur hebdomade dierum, non ogdoade, ut prisci Romani, neque Triscædecade, ut Mexicani. Nam secundum illa instituta aliæ periodi excogitandæ essent, quæ omnino cum veris rationibus tropicis nunquam quadrare possunt, ut hinc occultam*

occultam quandam vim ſeptenarii dierum agnoſcere poſsis. And a little after: *Divinitus igitur inſtitutus eſt numerus dierum ſeptenarius, qui ad omnem civilis anni ſolaris rationem commodiſsimus eſt, &, ut dixi, neſcio quid* [illegible] *habet.* Mr. *Purchas* in his pilgrimage, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. in the Margin ſaith, The Heathen by the light of nature had their weeks, as appeareth by naming the dayes after the ſeven Planets, &c. *Aret. Probl. de Sab.* He further alledgeth to prove the obſervation of one day of ſeven in every week to be naturall and morall. *Aquin. ſecunda ſecundæ, q.* 122. *art* 4. Mr. *Hooker Eccleſ. Pol. lib.* 5. §. 70. *Broughton* in his Concent. And *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. in the margin. *Septimana res omnibus quidem orientis populis ab ultima uſque antiquitate uſitata nobis autem Europæis vix tandem poſt Chriſtianiſmum recepta. Scal. de Emendat. T. l.* 1. *Antiquior eſt appellatio dierum*

rum ſeptimanæ ſub nominibus 7. planetarum quam horarum. Horæ nova appellatio à Græcis, Cor. lib. 7. & Caſaub. ad Athen. lib. 1. aliquanto poſt Ariſtotelis tempora. Which allegations of his may give juſt occaſion of further enquirie unto thoſe that are furniſhed with meanes and opportunities that way. See the Appendix in the fourth Exception, and the Anſwer to it.

For the ſecond, men cannot make perfecter diviſions of time then God himſelf hath made; and of theſe which he hath made if nature be put to determine out of which a ſufficient and convenient part muſt be taken, to be ordinarily employed in the ſolemne actions of religious ſervice, ſhe cannot but acknowledge that of neceſſity it muſt be either a day out of a week, or a day out of a moneth, or a moneth out of a yeer.

Now

Now as the first naturall divi-
sion of time is into dayes; so the
first naturall multiplication of
daies is into weeks. And these two
divisions of time are alwayes e-
quall, one naturall day or weeke
being never either longer or shor-
ter then another (understanding it
of those dayes and weeks which
are measured *per motum diurnum*
totius, if we speak either according
unto exact Astronomicall compu-
tation, or otherwise according
unto ordinarie vulgar account)
whereas moneths and yeers are
sometimes forced to admit or
loose odde minutes, houres, or
dayes to keep their courses even
in account. For that those two
dayes whereof we read, *Jos.* 10.
and *Isa.* 38. in length exceeded
others, was not naturall, but mira-
culous, and extraordinarie: and
therefore in the ordinarie compu-
tation of time they must passe in

the

the ſame rank with other dayes. And larger then one day of ſeven there is no part of time ariſing upon a naturall diviſion, becauſe the leaſt naturall proportion of time that ariſeth upon a multiplied revolution of dayes is a week. Leſſe then one day in a week then which is a *ſeventh day* in proportion, will not be allowed by the judgement of nature it ſelfe, as ſufficient to be employed in the ſolemne actions of religious ſervice. For I do not expect it ſhould be pretended agreeable either unto naturall or religious equitie, that a leſſe part is ſufficient for God, when a greater may more conveniently be had. But a day out of a moneth, or a moneth out of a yeer, would neither be convenient nor equall. Not convenient, becauſe the neceſſities both of religious and worldly affaires do equally require a mutuall enterchange of ſpeedier diſpatches.

dispatches, and quicker returnes. Not equall, because sometimes they must either be extended or contracted above ordinarie, or else the whole account of time put out of frame.

And so I have done with the former part of my *minor*, *viz.* that that interpretation wherein the fourth *Commandment* is taken to designe a *seventh day* in proportion onely, and not the *seventh day* in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinarie time of holy rest, includeth the common and naturall equitie of the *Commandment*, which obligeth all Gods people to the end of the world, and nothing else.

This onely let me adde, that when I speak of naturall equitie, I do not intend to acknowledge that equitie alone for naturall, which dim eyed nature, now in the state of corruption, can easily discover

to

to be ſuch: but if there be any other equitie, which nature in its pure eſtate of innocence could of it ſelf have ſeene to be ſuch, or which corrupted nature now not further blindfolded by paſſion or prejudice, but willingly giving it ſelf to be guided by the rules of right reaſon, muſt needs acknowledge to be ſuch when it is diſcovered, and made known; I make account that that likewiſe may be eſteemed naturall equitie. For I doubt not but ſtraight lines would be ſtraight, and naturally ſtraight, though the naturall ſtraightneſſe of them could never be demonſtrated unto us by any other meanes but onely by the uſe of artificiall inſtruments. And why may not many duties then be neceſſarie, naturally neceſſarie; the naturall neceſſitie whereof yet may not be now apparent unto us, but onely by divine diſcoveries

Is not according to the usuall saying, *Rectum* onely *index sui & obliqui?* Can we know that we do well by any other means, but onely by the same whereby we may likewise know whether we do ill or no? Saint *Paul* saith of himself, *I had not known sinne but by the Law: for I had not known lust, except the Law had said, thou shalt not covet. Rom.*7.7. And yet I suppose there is as much common naturall equitie in this *Commandment, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife, &c.* as in any of the other five that went before it. Though marriage be an ordinance of God, the institution whereof had never come unto our knowledge, if God himself had not conveighed it to us by his Word. Certainly divine discoverie by revealed light serves not onely to impose a necessitie of obedience where it was not before,

fore, but likewiſe ſometimes to informe us what neceſſarie duties nature it ſelfe would have taught us, that we ſtood obliged unto, had we and it continued ſtill in our primevall ſtate of integritie. The true God is not known unto us now to be ſuch as he is, but by revealed light, nor can be ſerved as he ought to be, but onely by thoſe that are inſtructed by himſelf: ſhall we therefore pretend that naturall equitie doth not oblige all men unto the knowledge and ſervice of the true God: Sure if we do, we may as well pretend, that either there is no naturall equitie at all in any thing; or that by naturall equitie we are not obliged to do any thing at all: for if the knowledge and ſervice of the true God be not neceſſarie, nothing is. Therefore me thinks it cannot be ſafe to exclude all thoſe out of the number of naturall duties, which

nature now cannot ſee to be ſuch without revealed light. For by that meanes, I ſuppoſe, we ſhould make it a difficult matter to convince a gain ſayer of a naturall neceſſitie in any kind of dury whatſoever. For whatever we could propound as a principle in nature, to ground the neceſſitie of a dutie upon, he might pretend it none of natures owne, but borrowed: ſhould we point him to the practiſe of the ſame, be it juſtice, mercie, chaſtitie, ſobrietie, or any other morall dutie exactly obſerved by meer heathen men, might he not pretend that they did that in imitation of the *Iſraelites*, unto whom were committed the Oracles of God, as well as that from them they borrowed their ſacrifices, and their ſolemne Feaſt dayes? Should we urge him with the teſtimonies of the moſt ancient Heathen Authors; might he not

not as eaſily reply, that *Moſes* wrote before them all, and that they might learne other things as well as the hiſtories of the Creation and the Flood from him? Should we preſſe him with examples of barbarous Nations, altogether unacquainted with letters and learning, whereby either the Laws or manners of other men might be conveighed unto their knowledge; might he not except againſt that evidence in ſome, unleſſe we our ſelves would yeeld to accept the ſame from him in all other particulars? why may not theſe evaſions ſerve a ruffians turn to ſhift himſelfe from under the yoke of other *Commandments*, as well as reverend Divines make uſe of the ſame, or the like, to put by the force of arguments urged for the ſanctification of one day in every week, as a neceſſarie dutie grounded on the fourth *Command-*

ment? We read not that *Sampſon* thought himſelfe any thing the leſſe obliged to perform the condition of the covenant he had entred into with his thirtie companions, becauſe he could truly ſay unto them: *If ye had not ploughed with my heifer, ye had not found out my riddle. Judg.* 14. 18. And if God in his Word diſcover his will concerning any thing which he would have his people do, and upon that diſcovery they can find it to be agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie (as the keeping holy of one day in every week is acknowledged to be) although they neither did nor could of themſelves conceive any ſuch thing before, me thinks, their future obligation ſhould be nothing abated by their former ignorance. See the *Appendix* in the fifth Exception, and the Anſwer to it.

Since then the ſufficiency and convenïency

conveniency of that proportion of time, whereof wee ſpeake, *viz. a ſeventh day*, or one day in every weeke, to be unto the people of God, the ordinary time of holy reſt, is ſo ſufficiently diſcovered unto them in the fourth *Commandment* by God himſelfe, that nature it ſelfe, I thinke, would be aſhamed to acknowledge reaſon in any thing that ſhould be pretended to the contrary. I durſt not exclude the perpetuall obſervation of that proportion from the compaſſe of that common and naturall equitie, which obligeth all Gods people to the end of the world: although I ſhould grant that without that diſcovery, nature now corrupted as it is, neither would nor could ever have taken any notice of it. For I preſume it might be well knowne to *Adam* in his ſtate of innocence, though after his fall, I doubt not, but his knowledge in

that, as in other particulars, was much impaired, and though all his posteritie till *Moses* time, had never heard of it: which whether they did or no, I thinke is more then can be certainly evidenced by any one necessary Argument. And that *Adam* once did know it, I am the rather induced to beleeve because it is now acknowledged to be very agreeable, both unto naturall and religious equitie, and I can hardly be perswaded that any thing of that nature was unknowne to *Adam* in his state of innocence, at least I thinke no man can prove this was.

For the latter part of my *Minor*, *viz.* that the Grammaticall construction of the words will beare that interpretation, and inforce no more, it is evident, as before, in that *dies septimus*, indifferently signifies, a seventh day in proportion, or the seventh day in order, and

and unleſſe other Arguments be brought to ſway, it will incline no more unto the one tranſlation then the other. And what better arguments to that purpoſe can there be, then thoſe that are drawne from analogie unto other places of Scripture, and the common received principles of Religion? which I conceive, plead ſtrongly for a ſeventh day in proportion onely, not for the ſeventh day in order alſo, accounting as I ſaid at firſt, from ſome one fixed period onely. And to that purpoſe I would argue thus:

That interpretation which agrees with the univerſall and perpetuall practiſe of Gods people, both under the Law and under the Goſpel, recorded in Scripture, as either directed or approved of by God himſelfe, or the Miniſters of God, inſpired by the holy Ghoſt, holds better analogie with other

places of Scripture, and the common received principles of Religion, then that which differs from it.

But that interpretation according unto which the fourth *Commandement* is taken to designe a seventh day in proportion onely, not the seventh day in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of holy rest, agrees with the universall and perpetuall practise of Gods people, both under the Law and under the Gospel, recorded in Scripture, as either directed or approved of by God himselfe, or the Ministers of God, inspired by the holy Ghost: and that interpretation according unto which the Commandement is taken, to designe both a seventh day in proportion, and the seventh day in order also differs from it: *Ergo*,

The *Major* is grounded upon these

these two, unlesse I mistake them, commonly received and undoubted truths.

First, That the Scriptures and the commonly received principles of Religion, doe never contradict themselves, or one another.

Secondly, That the universall and perpetuall practise of the people of God, both under the Law and under the Gospel, is agreeable both unto the Scriptures, and the commonly received principles of Religion: whence *Praxis sanctorum est interpres præceptorum*, hath sometimes passed in the nature of a principle.

For the *Minor*, we know that the people of God, both under the law and under the Gospel, have observed a seventh day in proportion, *viz.* one day in every weeke, as the ordinary time of holy rest, but not the seventh day in order, also accounting

counting from one prefixed period onely, *viz.* not the self-same day in every weeke, but under the Law the last, and under the Gospel the first. That wherein they all agree, is the same proportion of time; and that wherein they differ, is the order of the time proportioned. In this the practise of Gods people under the Law was directed and approved of by God himselfe: the practise of Gods people under the Gospel was, if not directed, yet at least approved of; if not by Christ himselfe, yet by his Apostles, infallibly assisted and directed by his holy Spirit.

The Bishop of *Ely*, upon another occasion, *pag.* 10. of his Epistle Dedicatory, hath these words; *The Apostles act was according to the Word, for they were men inspired by the holy Ghost.* Whereupon I assume. But the Apostles act was to observe a seventh day in proportion

on onely, not the ſeventh day in order alſo, as the ordinary time of holy reſt: and there is no other word but this of the fourth *Commandement*, according unto which that act could be. *Ergo*,

So that it ſhould ſeeme, what ever men doe now adayes, the Apoſtles and primitive Churches underſtood the fourth *Commandement*, to deſigne a ſeventh day in proportion onely, not the ſeventh day in order alſo, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of holy reſt. For if it had been as peculiarly proper to the *Iewes*, to ſet apart a ſeventh day in proportion, for the ordinary time of holy reſt, as it was to ſet apart that ſeventh day in order, which they did. The Apoſtles and the Primitive Churches would have found the ſelf-ſame neceſſitie of altering the proportion of the time, as the order of the time proportioned: which

which ſince they did not, it ſeemes they ſaw no reaſon why they ſhould. And certainly, if the fourth *Commandement* in the ſelf-ſame word, deſigned both, and God did purpoſely intend that his people ſhould ſo underſtand it, either both muſt be ceremoniall or neither, whereof the former is directly overthrowne by the practiſe, the other, by the doctrine of the Chriſtian Churches.

And hereupon it followes.

Firſt, That the fourth *Commandement* is neither rightly interpreted nor underſtood by them that take it in the literall ſenſe & meaning of it, to deſigne one definite or ſpeciall day of every weeke, as the firſt, ſecond, third, fourth, fift, ſixt, or laſt in order from ſome one prefixed period, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of holy reſt.

Secondly, That Saturday was no

no more the Sabbath of the fourth *Commandement* unto the Jewes, then Sunday is to Chriſtians.

Thirdly, That the deſignation of that one definite or ſpeciall day in every weeke, whereon the Sabbath ſhould be kept, both then was, and ſtill is *juris poſitivi.*

Fourthly, that the reaſon why the *Jewes* obſerved Saturday for their Sabbath, and Chriſtians Sunday for theirs, is not to be found, and ſo not to be ſought in the fourth *Commandement.* See the Appendix in the ſixt exception, and the Anſwer to it.

Fifthly, That Jewiſh ſuperſtition, ſo farre as concernes the ordinary time of holy reſt, is ſufficiently avoyded, and Chriſtian libertie aſſerted, by fixing it upon another day in order, although of the ſame proportion.

Sixthly, That the teſtimonies urged to evince the obſervation

of

of the Sabbath, now unlawfull, as that which was proper to the *Jewes*, must be understood of the Sabbath, not as it was a seventh day in proportion onely, but the seventh day in order also from that fixed period, at which the *Jewes* began their first account of weeks.

The

The second Proposition.

The fourth Commandment in the literall sense and meaning of it, is simply and perpetually Morall, as well as the second, third, fift, sixt, seventh, eighth, and ninth.

BY the literall sense and meaning of the fourth *Commandment*, I understand, as in the first proposition, that interpretation of the words, whereby they are understood to designe a seventh day in proportion onely, not the seventh day in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of holy rest.

By

By *simply and perpetually morall*, I understand such a Commandement, as wherein that which is commanded, is in its own intrinsecall nature and qualitie good, either is or may be resolved into some dictate or principle of the Law of nature, imprinted in mans heart at the creation, obliging all Gods people to universall & perpetuall obedience, both in regard of persons, times, and places. See the Appendix in the seventh Exception, and the answer to it.

I instance the second, third, fift, sixth, seventh, eight, and ninth Commandements, without making mention of the first and last, because I take the first and last Commandements, to comprise in generall all the duties of piety and charitie, which Gods people owe immediately to God himselfe, and mediately to God in one another: and the other eight to expresse

preſſe ſo many ſeverall branches of obedience, three in the firſt, and five in the ſecond Table, which God would have his people in a ſpeciall manner to take notice of: all which may be reduced unto as generally they are included in the other two, the firſt and laſt.

The propoſition thus explained, I confirme it thus:

That Commandement in the literall ſenſe and meaning of it, is ſimply and perpetually morall, as well as the ſecond, third, fift, fixt, ſeventh, eight, and ninth, which neither in the matter delivered, nor manner of delivery, doth any way differ more from them then they doe each from one another, but hath the characters of a Commandement, ſimply and perpetually morall, appertaining unto it as well as they. But the fourth *Commandement*, in the literall ſenſe and meaning of it, doth neither in the

the matter delivered, nor manner of delivery, any way differ more from the ſecond, third, fift, ſixt, ſeventh, eight, and ninth Commandements, then they doe each from one another: but hath the characters of a Commandement ſimply and perpetually morall, appertaining unto it as well as they, *Ergo:*

The *Major* I take to be evident of it ſelfe. For if it be not, it muſt either have ſome ſpeciall marke and ſtampe ſet upon it, either in the matter delivered, or manner of delivery, whereby Gods people may be able to diſtinguiſh between it and the reſt, or ſome expreſſe teſtimony, ſpeaking plainly to that purpoſe. But there is neither ſentence, nor word, nor ſyllable, nor title in the whole booke of God, that intimates any thing at all to this purpoſe, that of the ten Commandements uttered by God

God himſelfe on Mount *Sinai*, and writ with his owne finger in the two Tables, nine alone were ſimply and perpetually morall, one and that the fourth onely poſitive and ceremoniall. Either therefore we muſt finde ſome difference among the Commandments themſelves, or elſe wee can have no ground to fix the foot of a diſtinction on: and to diſtinguiſh where there is no difference, is a more likely meanes to maske an errour, then unfold a truth.

The *Minor* conſiſteth of three parts: the firſt concernes the matter delivered in the Commandements: the ſecond, the manner of delivery: the third, the characters of a Commandement ſimply and perpetually morall.

For the firſt, I take the matter delivered in the fourth *Commandement*, to be as before in the firſt propoſition, nothing elſe but the

deſig-

deſignation of a ſeventh day, in proportion onely, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of holy reſt. And in doing this, the fourth *Commandement* doth differ no more from the reſt of the Commandements, then they doe each from one another: for each of the reſt hath its ſpeciall object proper to it ſelfe, as well as the fourth: and there is no more difference between *Remember the Sabbath day to keepe it holy*, and, *Thou ſhalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vaine:* then there is between *Honour thy father and thy mother*, and, *Thou ſhalt not commit adultery.* And I ſhall take it for granted of the reſt, untill I ſee ſome inſtance given to the contrary.

For the ſecond, I take it to be out of queſtion, and that no man will deny, but that the fourth *Commandement* was delivered in the

the ſelf-ſame manner with the other nine.

For the third, if we take but thoſe three characters of a *Commandment* ſimply and perpetually morall, which are laid down by the Biſhop of *Ely*, *pag.* 28, 29, 30, 31. for ought I perceive they all appertain as well unto the fourth *Commandment*, as to the reſt. The fourth *Commandment* requiring no more in the literall ſence and meaning of it, as was formerly ſhewed in the firſt Propoſition; but that which nature it ſelfe may either obſerve, or at leaſt acknowledge to be in its own inward nature and qualitie good, yea neceſſarie to be obſerved by all Gods people at all times, and in all places. And the exception which the Biſhop in the pages following takes to the morality of the fourth *Commandment*, by application of thoſe characters is onely in reſpect of the

the *seventh day* in order, which he takes to be the literall and particular object of the *Commandment*.

But if the first Proposition stand fast, that the fourth *Commandment* in the literall sence and meaning of it doth designe a *seventh day* in proportion onely, not the *seventh day* in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinarie time of *holy rest*, this second will of necessity follow, that the fourth *Commandment* in the literall sence and meaning of it is simply and perpetually morall, as well as the second, third, fifth, sixth, seventh, eight and ninth. For in so doing, the fourth *Commandment* doth as the rest expresse no more but that which Gods people, by the light of their naturall understanding, might either observe, or at least acknowledge to be beseeming or good for them to do: and whatsoever may possibly be known to be

be of that qualitie doth bind men absolutely as they are men: as Mr. *Hooker* speaks. *Lib.* 1. §. 8. 9. 10.

And hence it follows.

First, That they who deny the fourth *Commandment* in the literal sence and meaning of it, to be simply and perpetually morall, may be justly suspected to hold no better opinion of the rest.

Secondly, That they who esteeme themselves not bound by vertue of the fourth *Commandment* to set apart one day in every week for the ordinarie time of *holy rest*, may think themselves as well at libertie to make images of God, and worship him therein, &c.

The third Propoſition.

If the Jews were neceſſarily bound to exerciſe or abſtaine from any thing upon the Saterday, which Chriſtians are not upon the Sunday, it was not by virtue of the fourth Commandment, but by ſome other poſitive Law.

BY the *Saterday*, I underſtand that day which the *Jews* ſet apart for their ordinarie time of holy reſt: not as deſigned in the fourth *Commandment*, but as that whereunto they were directed by the voice of God himſelfe, before the Law was publiſhed upon Mount *Sinai*; taking occaſion from that ſpeciall act of his providence, wherby he ſo diſpoſed that *Manna* where-

wherewith he fedde them in the wilderneſſe, ſhould faile to fall upon that day. *Exod.* 16. 22. &c. Which day is generally conceived to be the *ſeventh* in order from the Creation: and ſome undertake to prove it ſo: as *Joh Behm. Chronolog. Manuduct. lib.* 1. *Tit.* 3. *ca.* 3. But the arguments he urgeth to that purpoſe, are ſuch as have greater need of proofe themſelves then the concluſion he infers upon them; being but borrowed from that which I conceive to be a common errour: *viz.* that the ſanctification of the *ſeventh day* mentioned in *Gen.* 2. 3. and *Exod.* 20. 11. was purpoſely intended unto it, as well in reſpect of order as proportion. And whether the day which the *Jews* obſerved for their *Sabbath*, were the *ſeventh* in order from the Creation, or no, it matters not, if, as before in the firſt Propoſition, the fourth *Command-*

ment do designe a *seventh day* in proportion onely; not the *seventh day* in order also, to be unto the people of God the ordinarie time of *holy rest*.

By the *Sonday*, I understand that day which Christians set apart for their ordinarie time of *holy rest*: not as designed in the fourth *Commandment*, but as that whereunto they have been guided by the practise of the Apostles and primitive Churches: who were therein directed at the first, if not immediately by Christ himself, yet at least by that holy Spirit wherewith they were inspired, taking occasion from that act of Gods providence, whereby he so disposed, that Christ should rise again from the dead that day. Which that it was the first day in order of the week, accounting the *Saterday*, whereupon the *Jews* observed their *Sabbath* the last, is evident in all

all the foure Evangelists: but whether the first day in order from the Creation or no, untill it be resolved whether the *Saterday* were the *seventh*, is neither possible certainly to know, nor any way necessary to enquire.

The proportion thus explained, follows necessarily upon the two former. For if the literall sence and meaning of the fourth *Commandment* be no more but to designe a *seventh day* in proportion onely, to be unto the people of God the ordinarie time of *holy rest*: and if in this sence and meaning the fourth *Commandment* be simply and perpetually morall: then neither were the *Jews* by virtue of the fourth *Commandment* obliged to do any thing more, or Christians lesse, then to observe one day in *seven* as the ordinarie time of *holy rest*. That is one day in every week so to lay aside their

uſuall employment in civil affairs, that they may in a ſpeciall manner then be exerciſed in the ſolemne actions of religious ſervice; by performance whereof they may have, and make it appeare indeed, that they have the true God to be their God in their lives and converſations.

But what thoſe actions are wherein Gods people muſt then in a ſolemne manner be exerciſed

the fourth *Commandment* meddles not with particularly, onely it intimates they muſt be holy; and ſo makes a generall reference unto the firſt *Commandment*, wherein is required the actuall exerciſe of all thoſe actions, by performance whereof we have, and ſhew that we have the true God to be our God in every kind, both in our minds and underſtandings, our hearts and affections, our lives and converſations.

Theſe

These actions of religious service, the fourth *Commandment* requires all Gods people, when, and whereſoever in a ſpeciall manner, to exerciſe and imploy themſelves in one day in every week above the reſt: and to that purpoſe on that day to lay aſide their uſuall employments upon other dayes, and ſo to order their affairs, that ſix dayes diligence in worldly buſineſſe may ſufficiently provide for the convenience of a *ſeventh dayes* reſt, to be imployed in holy worſhip. And this is all that the fourth *Commandment* either did or doth oblige the *Jews* or us unto.

Other things the *Jews* were injoyned or forbidden to do upon their *Sabbath* the *Saterday*: as to have new bread put upon the table in the Tabernacle. *Levit.* 24. 8. to have the continuall burnt-offering and drink-offering doubled. *Numb.* 28. 9, 10. to kindle any fire.

Exod. 35. 3. But these and the like observances they stood obliged unto, not by vertue of the fourth *Commandment*, but by those other positive Laws which no more concern us Christians now, then the other ceremoniall and judiciall Laws appendixes onely of the morall, and appropriated unto the *Jews*.

And hence it follows,

First, That the example of the *Jews* in the observation of their *Sabbath*, is no necessarie rule for Christians now to guide themselves by in the observation of theirs, unlesse it may be made to appeare that therein they did nothing but what they were obliged to by virtue of the fourth *Commandment*.

Secondly, That the ground of obligation whereby Christians stand charged with sundrie particulars, to be observed by them upon

upon the *Lords day*, now muſt be drawn out of other *commandments*, and cannot be directly and immediately deduced from the fourth. As that ſuch or ſuch a company of people are publickly to meet together upon the *Lords day* in ſuch or ſuch a place, ſo often or ſo ſeldome, & there to continue ſo long or ſo ſhort a time in the performance of ſuch or ſuch actions of religious ſervice, dependeth upon poſitive laws either Eccleſiaſticall or Civill, of humane inſtitution, unto which men owe obedience by virtue of the fift *Commandment*. Yet ſo that they by whoſe authority thoſe laws are enacted, are limited in generall by the fourth *Commandment*, what to require by thoſe laws, *viz.* that which ordinarily may not hinder, but help to further the ſanctification of the *reſting day*.

The fourth Propoſition.

To call the Sunday now the Sabbath, is no more to Judaize, then it is to call the Miniſters of the Goſpel Prieſts, the Euchariſt a Sacrifice, or the Communion Table an Altar.

BY the *Sunday*, I underſtand that day of the weeke which is by Chriſtians now adayes obſerved, as the ordinary time of holy reſt, not ſimply in it ſelfe, but with relation to that uſe unto which it is put.

By *Judaizing*, I underſtand to doe or ſay ſomething, whereby we may be ſaid to have fellowſhip, or to partake with the *Jewes* in ſomething ſo proper unto them, that thereby they have been, or may

may be, not unfitly distinguished from all other Nations or societies of men.

By calling the Ministers of the Gospel *Priests*, the *Eucharist* a *Sacrifice*, and the Communion Table an *Altar*, I understand the unaffected applying of those particular names by Christians now adayes to such persons and things, as in regard of their office and use, carry some correspondence and analogie unto other persons and things, unto which the same names were under the Law applyed by the *Jewes*.

The proposition thus explained, I confirme it thus:

To Judaize is unlawfull for Christians. But to call the Sunday now the Sabbath, is no more unlawfull for Christians, then to call the Ministers of the Gospel Priests, &c. *Ergo.*

The *Major* I presume will not be

be denyed. The *Minor* may be proved thus.

That which is no more forbidden, is no more unlawfull. But to call the Sunday now the Sabbath; is no more forbidden, then to call the Table of the Lord an *Altar*, &c. *Ergo.*

Againe, the originall use of names is to be significant, *ad placitum imponentis*, and Christians have as much libertie and reason to use the word *Sabbath*, to signifie the Lords day, as the word *Sacrifice*, to signifie the Lords Supper. Or rather more, since the Lords day as now it is, or ought to be used amongst Christians, is properly a Sabbath day, that is, a day of rest: but the Lords Supper, a memoriall onely of the death of Christ, as our ordinary *Catechisme* teacheth us to speake.

Besides, to Judaize is to doe or say something, whereby wee may be

be ſaid to have fellowſhip, or to partake with the *Jewes* in ſomething proper unto them. But to call the Lords day the Sabbath, is not to doe that whereby wee may be ſaid to partake with the *Jewes* in any thing proper unto them. For they never called the Lords day the Sabbath, but the Saturday: and they more partake with the *Jewes*, that call the Saturday the Sabbath now, as the Papiſts and ſome others doe, then they that give that name unto the Lords day alone.

But the *Jews* gave that name unto their ordinary day of holy reſt.

Suppoſe they did: may not others therfore give the ſame name unto another day of holy reſt, and yet not Judaize? May not we call our Saviour Chriſt the Meſſias, becauſe the *Jews* call him ſo, whom yet they expect to come to

be

be their Saviour? But the truth is, it was not the *Jews* themselves that put that name upon the *Saterday*, their day of *holy rest*, but God himself taught them by *Moses* to apply that name unto that day. *Exod.* 16.23. and in the fourth *Commandment* hath put that name upon the ordinarie day of *holy rest* unto his people whensoever: one day in every week either is, or at least wise ought to be a Sabbath day, the Sabbath of the Lord. And our Saviour himself, *Matth.* 12.8. speaking of his owne authoritie over the time to be employed in holy worship: and *Mark.* 2.27. speaking of all mens equall interest unto the use of it, refuses not the name of *Sabbath*, but saith, *The Sonne of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* And, *The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.* He doth not say, the Sabbath was made for you *Jews* alone,

lone, and other men have nothing to do with it; but he ſpeakes of man indefinitely, and that is as much in effect, as generally of all men. So *Matth.* 24 20. he biddeth his diſciples pray that their flight be not on the *Sabbath day.*

And why ſhould we need to contend about names, if we agree concerning the things intended by thoſe names? The proper name of that which is neceſſarie cannot be unlawfull. We agree that there muſt be amongſt Gods people ſolemne times of holy reſt: we agree that the ordinary time of holy reſt to us is not the Saterday now, but the Sunday. Whether then is not the Sonday now a day of *holy reſt?* or is not the name *Sabbath* a fit name for ſuch a day? If the Sonday be not the ordinarie time of holy reſt to us, either then we have none at all, or ſome other: If none at all, how can we be freed from

from a just imputation of prophane impietie? If some other, then either that may beare the name of *Sabbath*, or else the name *Sabbath* is not a fit name for such a day: which none, me thinks, should dare to say, but he that presumes he can teach the holy Ghost to speak, who commonly cals all such dayes *Sabbaths*: and if it be a fit name for another day of the same nature, then why not for this? And it is a wonder to me how some men can find the necessarie observation of other holy dayes appointed by the Church and State, enjoyned by the name of Sabbaths, both in the fourth *Commandment*, and elsewhere in Scripture, and yet that it should be cried out against as Judaisme, when men speake of the Lords day by the same name. What if wee should call Sunday now the day of rest? were that any more to

The calling the Sun-day may as properly be said to be Heathenish, for that way from the dayes being dedicated to the Sun by them?

to Judaize, then it were to reſt that day? Is it Judaizing to uſe an Hebrew word of the ſame ſignification in ſtead of an Engliſh? why then ſhould it not be heathenizing to uſe a Greeke or Latine word? Are not other Jewiſh names of times as Pentecoſt, and Paſche ſtill in uſe? And were theſe any leſſe, nay were they not more ceremoniall then the ordinarie Sabbath was? But thoſe names have been anciently uſed; and the Sonday hath not been called the Sabbath till of late.

Suppoſe that were true, as I preſume it is not: may no names now adayes be uſed but thoſe that have been heretofore? *Horace* was of another mind when he ſaid:

——*Licuit ſemperq; licebit,*
Signatum preſente nota producere nomen.
Ut ſylvæ foliis pronos mutantur in annos.
Prima cadunt ita verborum vetus interit (ætas.

Et

Et juvenum ritu florent modo natæ vi-
(gentque.

And,

Multa renascentur quæ jam cecidere ca-
(dentque,
Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula si vo-
(let usus,
Quem penes arbitrium est & jus & nor-
(ma loquendi.

Or if antiquitie alone have the authoritie to grant a Warrant for the use of words; how is it that others are not branded for their upstart novelrie as well as this? For how many ages is it since the name *Puritan* hath been applyed unto such as being every way conformable unto the doctrine and discipline established by publick Authoritie in the Church, do onely dissent from particular men in some private opinions?

Put case the *Lords day* were not called the Sabbath heretofore: yet was it not called the *resting day*,

day, if not in Engliſh, yet in Latine? What elſe is the ſignification of the Latine word *Feria*, which they of the Church of *Rome* have put inſtead of Sabbath, when to diſtinguiſh the other dayes of the week they ſet themſelves of purpoſe to avoid both *Jewiſh* names and heatheniſh? Is it not granted, or at leaſt may it not be proved that the ordinarie time of *holy reſt* amongſt Gods people was transferred from the Saterday to the Sunday? And why may not that then carry the name which came in the place? Why may not the *Lords day* be honoured by Chriſtians with the name of Sabbath, as well as Chriſtians themſelves are honoured with the name of Iſraelites and Jews? Nay better ſince Chriſtians cannot be ſaid to be Iſraelites and Jews, but in a myſticall analogicall ſence; but the *Lords day* may be and is a Sabbath

bath day in a literall and proper ſence.

And hence it follows.

Firſt, That it ſeemes to ſavour more of peeviſh perverſneſſe, uncharitable prejudice, and a ſpirit of pride and contention, then of Chriſtian humilitie, and love to Gods ſervice, his people, and his truth: that the unaffected uſe of ſuch names in ſuch ſences is many times made a matter of reproach and ſcorn.

Secondly, That if any thing could be juſt amongſt men, wherein God and his truth are unjuſtly dealt with; it were but meet and equall that they who would deny men libertie to call the *Lords day* the Chriſtian Sabbath, ſhould themſelves be reſtrained from calling the Preachers of the Goſpel Prieſts, the Supper of the Lord a ſacrifice, and the Communion Table an Altar: or at leaſt, that they

they ſhould not be permitted to reſtraine the one till they refraine the other: ſince what they pretend either for or againſt the one, may as well, or rather better, be pretended for or againſt the other.

N.Y. SABBATH COMMITTEE LIBRARY

AN

AN APPENDIX unto the precedent Propositions, tending to satisfie some exceptions likely *to be taken to them.*

The first Exception.

THen it should seem this Law is not obligatory to the Heathen: Ergo, *no Law of nature nor simply morall.*

The Answer.

This notwithanding the fourth *Commandement*, may be simply morall, and a law of nature as well as any of the other nine. Nor is it any contradiction to say, that the worke

worke of the Law was written in the hearts of Heathen men; and yet that the *Jewes* had this advantage of all other Nations, that unto them alone were committed the Oracles of God; and that the promulgation of the Law at Mount *Sinai* was intended by God as a further obligation of obedience, unto none but the *Israelites* alone, and those that should enter into speciall covenant with God, as they had done: See *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. and *Rom.* 3. 1, 2.

The second Exception.

Your adversary, I suppose, would here deny your Major, *and say, that that interpretation gives the literall sense and meaning of the Commandement, which includeth not onely the common and naturall equitie thereof, obliging all, but also and more especially the particular determinati-*

on

on of the day, viz. *the Jewiſh Sabbath: for ſo Maſter* Broad *contends. To the* Minor *alſo he would perhaps ſay, that your interpretation includes not onely the common and naturall equitie of the Commandement, obliging all, but ſomething elſe too, which it ſhould not include (as the Commandement reſpecteth Chriſtians)* viz. *the ſpecification of the time* (i.e.) *that it muſt be one day in ſeven: which though he would grant to be agreeable to naturall equitie, yet he would deny it to be neceſſarily required thereby.*

The Anſwer.

Were it not for thoſe two clauſes (and nothing elſe, and enforce no more) I grant the *Major* might be denyed and juſtly. But that in the literall ſenſe and meaning of the Commandement, there ſhould be included any thing elſe, but what

what the *Grammaticall* construction of the words will enforce, or analogie to other places of Scripture, and the common received principles of Religion require, doth passe my understanding to conceive, nor do I think there is any reason can be given for it. For the *minor* I expected it would be denied, and therefore have endeavoured to prove it.

The third Exception.

By this reason is not the second and third Commandment also excluded as superfluous? For the first Commandment requiring so and so as you say, doth it not withall (implicitè *and* consequenter) *require too that we should not worship Images, nor blaspheme his name?*

The Answer.

This reason, I confesse, if it ex-

on of the day, viz. *the Jewish Sabbath: for so Master* Broad *contends. To the* Minor *also he would perhaps say, that your interpretation includes not onely the common and naturall equitie of the Commandement, obliging all, but something else too, which it should not include (as the Commandement respecteth Christians)* viz. *the specification of the time* (i.e.) *that it must be one day in seven: which though he would grant to be agreeable to naturall equitie, yet he would deny it to be necessarily required thereby.*

The Answer.

Were it not for those two clauses (and nothing else, and enforce no more) I grant the *Major* might be denyed and justly. But that in the literall sense and meaning of the Commandement, there should be included any thing else, but what

what the *Grammaticall* conſtruction of the words will enforce, or analogie to other places of Scripture, and the common received principles of Religion require, doth paſſe my underſtanding to conceive, nor do I think there is any reaſon can be given for it. For the *minor* I expected it would be denied, and therefore have endeavoured to prove it.

The third Exception.

By this reaſon is not the ſecond and third Commandment alſo excluded as ſuperfluous? For the firſt Commandment requiring ſo and ſo as you ſay, doth it not withall (implicitè *and* conſequenter) *require too that we ſhould not worſhip Images, nor blaſpheme his name?*

The Anſwer.

This reaſon, I confeſſe, if it ex-

cluded any as ſuperfluous, muſt needs exclude the ſecond and the third as well as others: but to ſay that the ſecond, third, and fourth *Commandments* are virtually included in the firſt; the fifth, ſixth, ſeventh, eight and ninth in the laſt; and may be reduced unto them, is not to exclude them as ſuperfluous, unleſſe we will ſay that all *compendiums* and *Epitomes* exclude all larger Tractates and Commentaries as ſuperfluous. Saint *Paul* ſaith, *He that loveth another, hath fulfilled the Law. Rom.* 13.8. And yet he thinks it not ſuperfluous to ſay, *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers, &c.* ver. 1. &c. It is true that the firſt *Commandment* requiring ſo and ſo, requires as you ſay withall (*implicitè & conſequenter*) that we ſhould not worſhip Images, nor blaſpheme Gods Name. But will any man pretend it ſuperfluous, that what hath

hath been once commanded *implicitè & consequenter* should again be commanded *explicitè & immediatè*? A great part of Scripture more by the same reason might be pretended superfluous; and that of *Solomon* alone might be sufficient. *Eccl.* 12. 13. *Fear God, and keep his Commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.* Besides that it is one thing to imply that a sufficient and convenient time is to be set apart for solemne worship, and another thing to expresse that proportion of time which ordinarily is both sufficient and convenient, as the fourth *Commandment* hath done.

The fourth Exception.

By this opinion it should seeme that the evidence of a necessarie duty pretended to be naturalis & perpetui juris, *the practise whereof all*

man do ſtand obliged unto, may depend upon ſuch Mathematicall ſpeculations as few men are acquainted with, it may be none ſo certainly aſſured of, as that they can ſatisfie the doubts which may be made of them by others; and it ſeems ſtrange that all men ſhould be bound to do that which but a few, if any at all can certainly perceive a neceſſitie of, or a truth in thoſe principles whereupon that evidence is pretended to be grounded.

The Anſwer.

But ignorance argues not an action unneceſſarie unto them in whom that ignorance it ſelf is inexcuſable. They that once did know, and ſtill might have known all that they ought to do, having loſt that knowledge through their own default, are no whit the leſſe obliged to obedience, although much

much more indeed altogether unable to performe it. St. *Paul* ſaith, *We are not ſufficient of our ſelves to think any thing as of our ſelves.* 2. *Cor.* 2. 5. and yet I doubt not but that there are ſome things which we ought to think, and that as *naturalis & perpetui juris*, though naturally (as now wee are) we know them not: otherwiſe there ſhould be nothing neceſſary now till a new diſcovery brought men again to be acquainted with it. Saint *Paul* ſaith, *We know not what we ſhould pray for as we ought.* *Rom.* 8. 26. and yet I preſume to pray for what we ſhould, and as we ought, is *naturalis & perpetui juris*, a neceſſarie dutie which no man can juſtly pretend himſelfe exempted from obedience to. If ignorance were alwayes accompanied with innocence, our Saviour needed not have ſaid, *Father forgive them, for they know not what*

they do. Luk. 23. 34. Nor would he have said, He that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes shall be beaten (though he added) with few stripes. *Luk.* 12. 48.

Nor do I in this contradict that which I said in the confirmation of the first Proposition, *viz.* If naturall equitie oblige men of necessitie to observe a sufficient and convenient time for solemne worship, then naturall equitie must presuppose men able to judge of the time to be so observed, whether it be sufficient and convenient or no, &c. For it sufficeth that once there was that abilitie in men then when they first entred into that bond, the losse of which abilitie since left them no lesse obliged afterward then they had been before. And I doubt not but that the revolutions of the heavens, and all the distinctions

ſtinctions of time made by their ſeverall motions were better known to *Adam* in his ſtate of innocence; and ſhould have been unto all his poſteritie, had they continued ſtill in that eſtate by the ſtrength of their naturall underſtandings, then ever they have been unto any man ſince by all the improvements that induſtrie hath been able to make of art and experience; and that then both the dutie it ſelfe enjoyned in the fourth *Commandment*, and the evidence of the neceſſity thereof, as *naturalis & perpetui juris*, with all the principles of reaſon, out of which that evidence might be drawne, were apparent enough and acknowledged by him. And if the ignorance and uncertainty of thoſe ſpeculations by which ſome men endeavour to regain unto themſelves, and impart unto others the knowledge of naturall things, do

argue the imperfection of that evidence which naturall men may now have of their duties in this or any other kind whatsoever; yet argue they not the things in themselves to be any whit the lesse either certain or necessarie: Should we therefore deny the fifth *Commandment* which saith, *Honour thy father and thy mother*, to be *naturalis & perpetui juris*, and say, that all men are not necessarily obliged to the obedience of it, because few men or none are able to understand, and certainly resolve upon the truth of those philosophicall speculations which concerne humane generation, and the varietie of those circumstantiall accidents which make our English proverbe true, He is a wise Sonne that knoweth his own father: or those principles of policie wherein the relations that are between Princes and their Subjects have their first foun-

foundation, and the like: yet it may be the perfect understanding of these would afford no little evidence, I say, not unto the equitie alone, but even unto the necessitie of that obedience.

Again, I do not either onely or mainly relie upon Mathematicall or Philosophicall speculations to evidence the necessitie of a weekly Sabbath, but principally upon divine discovery. Yet as Saint *Paul* disputing at Athens, *Act.* 17. 28. alledged a sentence of the heathen Poets to evidence the truth of the Creation, and consequently to overthrow their Idoll-worship: so I doubt not, but that the observations of Art and experience may be usefully applyed to convince a gain-sayer of the naturall equitie and necessitie of obedience unto that *Commandment*, wherby Gods people are required to set apart one day in every week as the ordinary

d inarie time of holy reſt, though thoſe obſervations may be no more either generally known, or commonly received for undoubted truths, then that ſaying of the Poets was. But what the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* ſaith of tongues, 1 *Cor.* 14. 22. they are for a ſigne not unto them that beleeve, but to them that beleeve not: the ſame would I ſay, of theſe teſtimonies drawn from the obſervations of Art and experience, they are for an evidence not unto them that thinke the diviſion of time into weeks, conſiſting of ſeven dayes apiece, to have been made by God himſelf in the Creation; but unto them that are otherwiſe minded: to whom they may be as the *Philiſtines* forges were unto the *Iſraelites*, 1 *Sam.* 13. 20. places to ſharpen their ploughſhares, coulters, axes and mattocks in. For however it be true that the Apoſtle ſaith,

ſaith, *Hebr.* 11.3. By faith we underſtand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God; ſo that things which are ſeen were not made of things that did appear; and they that entertain the Scriptures as the oracles of God, dare not admit a thought to the contrary: yet was it never held either unlawfull, unfit, or unneceſſarie to bring Philoſophicall Arguments in as handmaids to attend upon Divine diſcoverie in clearing the doctrine of the worlds Creation. And ſince in this queſtion of the Sabbath there is now adayes a kind of appealing from the fourth *Commandment* to the light of nature, whoſe eye-ſight hath been long ago decayed, me thinks, we may well allow her the uſe of Art and experience, as ſpectacles, or perſpective glaſſes, through which ſhe may ſee both further and clearer, then other-

wiſe

d inarie time of holy reſt, though thoſe obſervations may be no more either generally known, or commonly received for undoubted truths, then that ſaying of the Poets was. But what the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* ſaith of tongues, 1 *Cor.* 14. 22. they are for a ſigne not unto them that beleeve, but to them that beleeve not: the ſame would I ſay, of theſe teſtimonies drawn from the obſervations of Art and experience, they are for an evidence not unto them that thinke the diviſion of time into weeks, conſiſting of ſeven dayes apiece, to have been made by God himſelf in the Creation; but unto them that are otherwiſe minded: to whom they may be as the *Philiſtines* forges were unto the *Iſraelites*, 1 *Sam.* 13. 20. places to ſharpen their ploughſhares, coulters, axes and mattocks in. For however it be true that the Apoſtle ſaith,

ſaith, *Hebr.* 11.3. By faith we underſtand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God; ſo that things which are ſeen were not made of things that did appear; and they that entertain the Scriptures as the oracles of God, dare not admit a thought to the contrary: yet was it never held either unlawfull, unfit, or unneceſſarie to bring Philoſophicall Arguments in as handmaids to attend upon Divine diſcoverie in clearing the doctrine of the worlds Creation. And ſince in this queſtion of the Sabbath there is now adayes a kind of appealing from the fourth *Commandment* to the light of nature, whoſe eye-ſight hath been long ago decayed, me thinks, we may well allow her the uſe of Art and experience as ſpectacles, or perſpective glaſſes, through which ſhe may ſee both further and clearer, then other-

wiſe

wise of her self she can do, and rather blesse God that affords us any help that way, then lightly esteeme the lessons we may learn thereby.

The fifth Exception.

If God discovers his will concerning the offering up unto him external and bloody sacrifices of sheep, oxen, &c. upon this discovery man by the light of nature in such manner qualified as you speak of (in the beginning of this inserted addition) may discern and acknowledge it to be agreeable to naturall and religious equitie, to offer up such sacrifices unto him; and yet the thing it selfe, viz. *this kind of offering or sacrificing is not for all that* naturalis & perpetui juris. *So here might some one say in this case.*

The Answer.

If God had discovered his will concerning

concerning the offering up unto him externall and bloody ſacrifices of ſheep, oxen, &c. at the ſame time, and in the ſame manner as he did diſcover his will concerning the ſetting apart one day of ſeven for a weekly Sabbath; I ſhould have thought that diſcoverie a ſtrong inducement to conceive that to be *naturalis & perpetui juris*, as well as this. For though as the Biſhop of *Ely* ſpeaks, *pa.* 54. theſe circumſtantiall accidents make no alteration of the internall and naturall forme or qualitie of the materiall object of this (or indeed of any other) *Commandment*, nor conclude by a neceſſary inference all thoſe, and onely thoſe precepts that then, and ſo were uttered to be ſimply and perpetually morall, yet they afford a verie probable Argument to perſwade us, that all that which was then and ſo delivered, was purpoſely

intended

intended by God to be of the ſame binding power to the ſame perſons. But to let that paſſe. When God did diſcover to his people his will concerning the offering up unto him externall and bloodie ſacrifices of ſheep, oxen, &c. *Deut.* 12. 4. &c. he did withall diſcover to his people that his will was not to require or to permit them the performance of that ſervice every where, but expreſly confined them unto the place which he ſhould chuſe to put his Name there. And the Apoſtle St. *Paul* tells us plainly, *Hebr.* 9. 9, 10. that Gods intent and purpoſe was not that his people ſhould ſtand alwayes alike obliged unto thoſe obſervances, but onely untill the time of Reformation. There is no ſuch limitation for the ſanctification of the Sabbath day, nor did the *Jews* ever underſtand it ſo.

And yet I reſt not in this anſwer

ſwer neither, becauſe I know that though the offering up of bloudy ſacrifices were limited and confined in reſpect of place, yet other ceremoniall obſervances were not. Therefore I goe further and ſay, that God diſcovering his will in this kinde, upon this diſcovery man by the light of nature in ſuch manner qualified, as I ſpeake of, might diſcerne and acknowledge it indeed to be agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, to offer up ſuch ſacrifices unto him. But how? not abſolutely and ſimply agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, in regard of the thing it ſelfe required, but onely *ſecundum quid*, and *ex hypotheſi*, in regard that it was required by him whoſe authoritie is abſolute, and his revealed will the rule of righteouſneſſe. For ſet aſide the Commandement, and what neceſſitie or fitneſſe can any man by the light

of

of nature finde in a pigeon or a lambe, more then in an Eagle or a Lyon, to be offered in sacrifice to God? yea what reason why such consecrated things should rather dye then be preserved alive? As types of the all-sufficient perfect sacrifice of Christ, wee may conceive it fit to be so: but then wee goe beyond the bounds of morall duties, and enter into a consideration of an higher nature then humane reason can pretend unto. But in the observation of one day of seven, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time of holy rest, I thinke and I have endeavoured to shew, that nature will acknowledge such a fitnes as is not to be found in any other proportion of time whatsoever. And this I conceive is a maine difference, that may be and must be observed and acknowledged to be between such things, as when they are discovered

covered to be agreeable unto the will of God, may withall by the light of humane reaſō be acknowledged to be agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie. As for example; dare any man deny it agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, that God commanding it, *Abraham* ſhould ſacrifice his ſonne, and the *Iſraelites* rob the *Egyptians*? yet neither of them both was *Naturalis & perpetui juris.* And on the other ſide, not to covet that which is another mans, is I ſuppoſe without queſtion, *Naturalis & perpetui juris*, and ſince God hath diſcovered his will to that purpoſe, men by that remaining remnant of the light of nature, which they have, may diſcerne and acknowledge it to be agreeable unto naturall & religious equitie, but that which it may be no man ever would have light upon, if God had not led them to it

by

by his Law. Saint *Paul* saith expresly, *I had not knowne lust* (namely to be sinne) *except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet*, Rom. 7. 7. The marriage of one man unto one woman onely, appeares to be *Naturalis & perpetui juris*, by that of the Prophet *Malachie*, *Mal.* 2. 14. &c. And he proves it by that act of Gods providence in the creation, that he made but one, although he had the residue of the Spirit. Yet who could ever have attained to the knowledge thereof, if God himselfe had not revealed it? So the observation of one day in seven, as a weekly Sabbath, appears to be *Naturalis & perpetui juris*, by the fourth *Commandement*, and is proved so to be by that act of Gods providence in the creation, that he disposed all time in respect of use, to be employed in labour, or in rest; and for proportion ordinarily allowed six dayes of labour

bour unto one of it? although men peradventure since the fall had never knowne this, if *Moses* had not recorded the history of the creation. So that, it seemes, of things which appeare upon occasion of divine discovery, and not otherwise to be agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, one may be *Naturalis et perpetui juris*, and another not.

Againe, peradventure, some would say (which yet I doe not) that externall and bloudy sacrifices were so farre agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, that they might still be practised by the people of God, so that it were not with opinion of necessitie, and as types in reference unto Christ to come. What else is the meaning of those words in the Bishop of *Ely*, *pag.* 62. *Our Saviour although he disannulled the old Law in respect of observation in the time of the Gospel,*

ſpel, yet he eſtabliſhed and confirmed the lawfull uſe thereof in the Chriſtian Church. Which words, if wee ſhould ſtretch them to their utmoſt extent, would I doubt not bring both bloudy ſacrifices and almoſt, if not abſolutely, all the rites and ceremonies of the Law within the reach of Chriſtian liberty, and then I preſume the Sabbath ſhould be no more excluded then the reſt. How ever, I perſwade my ſelfe, the generall practiſe of the Churches of Chriſt in all places and at all times (which if any thing be, is able to prove a Catholick tradition) in ſetting apart one day in every week, as their ordinary time of holy reſt (which is all that I pretend to be ſimply and perpetually morall; yea, all that is intended in the fourth *Commandement*) and in rejecting the uſe of bloudy ſacrifices, and the like, is a ſufficient evidence that they have

have alwayes entertained a different opinion of the one and of the other. So that it is no necessary consequence to say, that because bloudy sacrifices are not *Naturalis & perpetui juris*, therfore a seventh day Sabbath is not, though both be agreeable unto naturall and religious equitie, and that seen onely by occasion of divine discovery: since in the one it may be seen, as properly belonging to the thing it selfe, in the other, no otherwise but onely with reference to Gods revealed will.

The sixt Exception.

The reason of the Jewes observation, it seemes, is to be found apparently in the very body of the Commandement, in these words: For in six dayes the Lord made heaven and earth. כי *quoniam, nam, enim:* and *afterward* על־כן *idcirco.*

Therefore

Therefore the Lord bleſſed the ſeventh day - the ſeventh day? Which ſeventh day? why that wherein he reſted: and that was the Jewiſh Sabbath. This Maſter Broad *ſtands moſt upon.*

The Anſwer.

The reaſon of the *Jewes* obſervation, in part, I confeſſe, is to be found in the Commandement, *viz.* in that they obſerved one day in every week, but not in that they obſerved that day in order, which they did. Neither doe I take that reaſon which is to be found to be in the body of the Commandement, but added to the explication of it: the body of the Commandement being compriſed in thoſe words, *Remember the Sabbath day to keepe it holy*, whereof the words following are an explication, *Sixe dayes, &c.*

And

And that which followeth, *For in ſix dayes, &c.* I take to be a reaſon of the explication, not of the Commandement it ſelf. It is true, Maſter *Broad* ſtands moſt upon this, that the Commandement deſignes that day which was obſerved by the *Jewes*: and ſo doth the Biſhop of *Ely*, affirming it to be the literall and ſpecificall object of the Commandement. But this which they ſtand moſt upon, for ought I can perceive, hath moſt need to be, but is leaſt of all proved to bee intended in the Commandement.

The force of the rationall and illative particles, *for* and *therefore*, I acknowledge and confeſſe, they prove ſtrongly that which they are intended to prove, both the ſufficiency and the convenience of a ſeventh day in proportion, one day in every weeke, to be unto the people of God the ordinary time

of

of holy reſt. For in that God obſerved that proportion himſelfe, it may very well be taken to be an evidence of his puppoſe and intent, that men ſhould obſerve it too, and uſe the ſame diviſion and diſtinction of time which he himſelfe had done, and ordinarily imploy it ſo. But to inferre a neceſſitie of obſerving the ſame day in order, which was at firſt obſerved by God, becauſe the ſame proportion of time is to be obſerved by men that was obſerved by him, is to diſpute *à dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum ſimpliciter*, or *petere principium*, to take that for granted which may be denyed. That God intended to require of his people the obſervation of the ſame proportion of time, cannot in reaſon be denyed: but that he intended to require of them the obſervation of the ſame order of the time proportioned, cannot I thinke be proved.

The

The seventh Exception.

I would this resolution were made apparent more fully and clearely. And if it may be so resolved, why doe you make it obligatory onely to Gods people, and not to all men universally? And doe you thinke that the Israelites did one whole day or other every weeke vacare solenni cultui divino, *in the time of the grievous Egyptian bondage? or if not, that they did therein violate or goe against a dictate and principle of the Law of nature? &c. Wee may put the same case in Christians now adayes under Turkish tyranny and slavery, or the like.*

The Answer.

The clearing to the full of this resolution is the thing I labour for: and if it be not as apparent unto

others as it seems to me, I wonder not who know that every man abounds in his owne sence. But since the way of truth is that which I seek, I shall entertain it as a speciall favour from any man that will inform me where I wander from it.

In what sence I make the *Commandment* obligatory onely to the people of God, and not to all men universally, I did intimate before: not in regard of the subject matter of it, but in regard of a further tye put upon them by the speciall promulgation of it at Mount *Sinai*: a respect which I take to be equally common to the fourth with the rest of the *Commandments*.

Your instances of the *Israelites* in the time of the Egyptian bondage, and Christians now adayes under Turkish tyranny and slaverie, or the like, I acknowledge

to

to be both of the ſame nature: and doubt not but that they then might, and theſe now may, notwithſtanding their ſubjection to ſuch grievous ſlaverie, ſanctifie a Sabbath day *vacando cultui divino ſolenni*; and that for one whole day or other in every week, although not with that publick ſolemnitie which *in ſtatu libero*, and *Rep. pacata*, they might have done: yet with ſuch private devotion as God would have been contented to accept from them in that eſtate, and wherewith they might encourage themſelves, and cheer up their own ſouls as *David* did, if not in the ſame, yet in a caſe not much unlike: *Pſal.* 42. and *Pſal.* 43. throughout. But whether they did ſo or no, ſince God in his Word hath not thought good to tell us, I think there is no neceſſitie at all that we ſhould enquire. And both of them and Chriſtians now a-

daies in the case that you propound, I think it more charitie to hope the best, then wisedome to suspect the worst. Which yet if we should suppose and grant, that thereupon it would follow which you seem to fear, that in so doing they did violate or go against a dictate and principle of the Law of Nature; I think it would prove no more then might be pretended, that they did not onely then, but both before and after in the practise of *Polygamie*: unlesse we will say that to commit adultery was not so much to violate and go against a dictate or principle of the law of nature, as to prophane the Sabbath day in case the fourth *Commandment* were simply and perpetually morall: which no man can say, but that withall he must confesse that the fourth *Commandment* is simply and perpetually morall as well as the *seventh*:

which

which if it be granted of that one, I hope will not be denyed of the reſt.

Beſides that, ſuppoſe the fourth *Commandment* had been but a poſitive law that bound the *Iſraelites*, and none but them, to obſerve one day in every week as the ordinarie time of *holy reſt*, yet the obſervation thereof might have been as impoſſible, at leaſt as difficult and dangerous for them afterwards in the time of the Babylonian captivitie (when the enemie mocked at their Sabbaths. *Lam.* 1. 7. when *Darius* made a Decree that whoſoever ſhould ask a Petition of any God, or man, for thirtie dayes, ſave of the King himſelf, ſhould be caſt into the den of Lyons. *Dan.* 6. 7. And when we may eaſily beleeve that others as well as *Jehojachin* and *Zedechias* were bound in chains, and kept in priſon a long time together) as

it would have been before in the time of the Egyptian bondage, or can be for Christians now adayes under *Turkish* tyrannie.

And shall we think that the *Jews* did one whole day or other every week *vacare solenni cultui divino*, in the time of the Babylonian captivitie? Or if not, that they did violate and go against a dictate or principle of the law of nature, in disobeying a positive law of Divine institution, whereof there is no reason at all to conceive they could be ignorant? If the former, why may we not as well conceive that the *Israelites* did so in the time of the Egyptian bondage? For ought I know, there is as much testimonie in Scripture of the one, as of the other that is of neither any at all. If the latter, this objection will make no more against the simple and perpetuall moralitie of the fourth *Cammand-*

ment

ment, then againſt the morall equitie thereof, if it be taken to be poſitive: for the divine inſtitution therof, I ſuppoſe, wil never be denied, nor that to live in diſobedience to a poſitive law of divine inſtitution which men are ſufficiently informed of that it is ſuch, is to violate and go againſt a dictate and principle of the Law of Nature.

The onely pretence that I can probably conjecture may be made to the contrary is this, that the fourth *Commandment* was not intended by God to put a bond of obedience upon the *Iſraelites* generally as they were men, or as they were entred into ſpeciall covenant with God; but as they were to live in *in ſtatu libero*, and *Rep. pacata*: wherein they might have convenient opportunitie and libertie for the ſolemne exerciſe of publick worſhip. And therefore that though the *Jews* in the

time of the Babylonian captivitie, and other such extremities should not have practised obedience unto the fourth *Commandment*, *vacando solenni cultui divino*, one whole day or other every week, yet they should not have lived in disobedience unto a positive Law of divine institution, whereof they were not ignorant, and so not have violated or gone against a dictate and principle of the Law of Nature, because in that case the *Commandment* bound them not; and where there is no Law, there is no transgression.

But to this I answer. First, that there may be solemne actions of religious service privately performed, and that all solemne worship is not publick. For to the solemnitie of any action sundrie circumstances may concurre, whereof to be publickly performed, is but one, and in defect thereof, either any,

or

or at leaſt ſome of the reſt may ſerve to make the performance of an action ſolemne: for I take ſet and ſolemne actions to be properly oppoſed unto ſudden and occaſionall. I thinke the Church of *Rome* would hardly be perſwaded to confeſſe that a private Maſſe were not a part of ſolemne ſervice, and if ſhe could as eaſily prove it to be truly religious worſhip, as ſhe might that the exerciſe of it is a ſolemne action, I ſee not why ſhe ſhould be blamed for it. Nor can I conceive how ſolemnitie and privacie ſhould not be taken to concurre in that great mourning, whereof the Prophet *Zacharie* ſpeaks, *Zech.* 12. 11. &c. when all the families that remain ſhall mourne, every family apart, and their wives apart. What action of religious ſervice amongſt the *Iſraelites* was more ſolemne then the celebration of the Paſſe-

over? Yet one of the ordinances of it was, that it must be eaten in their private houses by every family apart; and that none must go out of the doore of his house untill the morning. *Exod* 12.21.22.

Secondly, if it may be truly pretended, that the fourth *Commandment* as a positive law obliged not the *Jews*, but onely *in statu libero*, and *Rep. pacata*, why may not the like be pretended likewise of other positive Laws as those which restrained their marriage with other Nations, and eating of unclean beasts, and the like? Which yet it appears they were obliged to even in the time of the Babylonian captivitie, and their greatest extremities. Nay if with the Papists we should thinke that the second *Commandment* were no more simply and perpetually morall, then the fourth *Commandment* is pretended to be, but that in respect

ſpect of the literall and ſpecificall object of it, it was onely poſitive, and obliged none other but the people of *Iſrael*, why might we not likewiſe pretend that it bound not them neither, but *in ſtatu libero*, and *Rep. pacata?* And ſo that *Shadrach*, *Meſhach*, and *Abednego* were more preciſe then needed, when they choſe rather to expect a miracle of deliverance in the fierie fornace, then they would fall down and worſhip the golden Image which *Nebuchadnezzar* had ſet up. And the like may be ſaid of other *Commandments*.

Thirdly, if we ſhould acknowledge it true, that the fourth *Commandment* did not oblige the *Jews* but onely in *ſtatu libero*, and *Rep. pacata*, why ſhould this limitation be reſtrained to it onely upon a pretence that it was but a poſitive Law, and not as well be extended unto it in caſe it be ſimply and per-

perpetually morall? May not the fourth *Commandment* ſtill ſtand in as full force unto Chriſtians, as ever it did unto the *Iſraelites*, and yet bind them no more then it did theſe; ſave onely then when they might have convenient opportunitie, and libertie of exerciſing publick worſhip? If onely publick worſhip were required of the *Iſraelites* on the ordinarie Sabbath, thoſe caſes of neceſſitie wherein they were diſpenſed with, or rather wherein the *Commandment* did not oblige them at all, will alter nothing of the nature of it; but that notwithſtanding it may be either ſimply and perpetually, or onely poſitively morall: for the queſtion now is not whereunto, but when, and whom it binds.

And ſo, me thinks, this exception is much like that of the Biſhop of *Ely*, *page* 175. &c. drawn from the neceſſitie of a morall poſſi-

poſſibilitie in all juſt Laws, which he denyes the Law of the fourth *Commandment* to be capable of in reſpect of all Nations. For he granteth that the fourth *Commandment* made one day of ſeven a weekly Sabbath, and that the weekly Sabbath was to be a naturall day of twenty foure houres: but he pretends it obligatorie onely to the *Jews*, not unto all Nations; becauſe, ſaith he, ſome Nations have no ordinarie weeks containing ſeven particular dayes, diſtinguiſhed each from other by the riſing and ſetting, and by the preſence and departure of the Sunne: as thoſe that live in the Northerne Climates under 70. 75. 80. 85. and 90. degrees.

Where firſt I conceive, there is a miſtake of naturall dayes, being divided and diſtinguiſhed from one another by the riſing and ſetting of the Sunne: which is not the

the diſtinction of naturall dayes (as he underſtands them, *viz.* dayes conſiſting of twentie-foure equall houres a piece) but of artificiall: the naturall day ſo underſtood, being properly diſtinguiſhed by the acceſſe and receſſe of the Sunnes center unto and from the meridionall line, as the artificiall day in that ſence is diſtinguiſhed by the center of the Sunnes acceſſe unto and receſſe from the Horozontall line: all which are diſcernable even in thoſe climates which he ſpeaketh of, and ſo the diſtinction of dayes and weeks, as poſſible to the people living there as in other places. The occaſion of which miſtake, may have been the different application of the termes of that diſtinction by divers men, ſome calling that the artificiall day, which others call the naturall and *vice verſa*: which not being well obſerved or not much

much regarded, it was eaſie to ſlip *a genere in genus*, and to underſtand that of the one which was ſpoken of the other by the ſame name. And yet to confeſſe the truth, before we admit that definition of a naturall day, and that diſtinction of one naturall day from another, we had need to diſtinguiſh of a naturall day, that it is either that which is exactly ſuch indeed, or that which is vulgarly accounted ſuch. That which is exactly ſuch indeed, may be called *dies mundanus*, or *periodus æquatoris*, being the meaſure of that motion whereby in the ſpace of twenty-foure equall houres, any one poynt in the *æquator*, or in any other of the paralell circles is carried round, and brought againe to the ſelfe ſame meridionall line: and this of all other diviſions of time made by the motions of the heavens, is the moſt ſimple, and alwayes

alwayes equall to it ſelfe. That which is vulgarly accounted ſuch, may be called *dies ſolaris*, or *periodus ſolis diurna*, being the meaſure of that time, wherein by the diurnall motion of the Univerſe, the center of the Sunne is carried round, and brought againe unto the ſame meridionall line: and this of all other diviſions of time, made by the motions of the heavens, comes neereſt in exact perfection unto that which is made by the diurnall motion of the Univerſe, but in it ſelfe is not exactly equall: and of a naturall day in this latter acceptation, muſt the former paſſages be underſtood.

Secondly, if that pretended impoſſibilitie were granted, he muſt likewiſe pretend it impoſſible that the *Jewes* ſhould have lived in one of thoſe climates, or elſe confeſſe the Law unjuſt, if the *Jewes* living there ſhould have been bound to the

the obedience of it: unleſſe he will pretend that the fourth *Commandement* did binde the *Jewes* in ſome places of the world, but not in all: and then it would follow, that the *Jewes* by removing of their habitations, might have freed themſelves from that yoke of bondage, as ſome eſteeme it to have been.

So in the caſes you propoſe of the *Egyptian* bondage, and of *Turkiſh* tyranny, there is no inconvenience can be pretended to the *Iſraelites* then, or Chriſtians now, from the bond of the fourth *Commandement*, as of a naturall Law, but ſo, that the *Jewes* at other times might have been ſubject to the like, by reaſon of their obligation to the ſame, as to a poſitive Law of divine inſtitution, if it had been intended onely unto them.

FINIS.